NARCOTICS CONTROL CONFERENCE

HEARING

BEFORE THE

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

NINETY-NINTH CONGRESS

SECOND SESSION

FEBRUARY 10, 1986

SCNAC-99-2-7

Printed for the use of the
Select Committee on Narcotics Abuse and Control

U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

69-935 WASHINGTON : 1987

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, Congressional Sales Office
U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC 20402

H961-20,

SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL

CHARLES B. RANGEL, New York, *Chairman*

PETER W. RODINO, JR., New Jersey
FORTNEY H. (PETE) STARK, California
JAMES H. SCHEUER, New York
CARDISS COLLINS, Illinois
DANIEL K. AKAKA, Hawaii
FRANK J. GUARINI, New Jersey
ROBERT T. MATSUI, California
DANTE B. FASCELL, Florida
WALTER E. FAUNTROY, District of Columbia
WILLIAM J. HUGHES, New Jersey
MEL LEVINE, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas
LAWRENCE J. SMITH, Florida
EDOLPHUS "ED" TOWNS, New York

BENJAMIN A. GILMAN, New York
LAWRENCE COUGHLIN, Pennsylvania
E. CLAY SHAW, JR., Florida
MICHAEL G. OXLEY, Ohio
STAN PARRIS, Virginia
GENE CHAPPIE, California
DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOSEPH J. DIOGUARDI, New York
MICHAEL L. STRANG, Colorado
JOHN G. ROWLAND, Connecticut

COMMITTEE STAFF

JOHN T. CUSACK, *Chief of Staff*
ELLIOTT A. BROWN, *Minority Staff Director*

NARCOTICS CONTROL CONFERENCE

MONDAY, FEBRUARY 10, 1986

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
SELECT COMMITTEE ON NARCOTICS ABUSE AND CONTROL,
New York, NY.

The Select Committee met, pursuant to call, at 10 a.m., in Room 305, 26 Federal Plaza, New York, New York, Hon. Charles B. Rangel (chairman of the Select Committee) presiding.

Present: Representatives Charles B. Rangel and Benjamin A. Gilman.

Staff present: Elliott A. Brown, Minority Staff Director; John T. Cusack, Chief of Staff, and Edward H. Jurith, counsel.

The CHAIRMAN. I know how valuable time is. We have a very structured document here, but that should not scare you. The reason we have it is because staff had to come up with something in order to direct our thinking.

But, believe me, you are the experts. We are not here to point you in the right direction because we don't know the right direction. But we are here to say that if we can't come up with some answers in New York City and in this area, then the situation—well, I am not going to get involved with those types of adjectives, but you should know there is not a show that I am on, and I was on again this morning, and you are subject to this type of thinking, "Listen, if you can't handle it overseas, on the borders, or on the streets, why don't you think about legalizing it?"

And then when we had hearings on our Southern border a couple weeks ago, drug enforcement agents are now getting more honest than they have ever been by saying even if they had all of the resources that would be on their wish list, that they would only be able to interdict 15 percent, which is a guesstimate of what is coming into this country. And so, you know, I assumed the chairmanship of this committee only after Ben Gilman agreed he wouldn't leave me in this, but if we start thinking that it is hopeless in the committee, then we are out of business.

Let me share with you, as experts, some things that are not going to be contradicted, even though politically it depends on who is saying it, whether it is the Secretary of State or whether it is Rangel and Gilman. The truth of the matter is supported by the United Nations is that every drug-producing country is having bumper crops. We have visited those countries over the last several years, we can give you all of the reasons why they are having the bumper crops, the farmers are dependent on the crops, the corruption, the national sovereignty, the resistance to eradication, the

changes in government, the national debt, the unavailability of equipment to cut back and find assistance.

Listen, I could be here for hours explaining why we are not eradicating the marijuana, why we are not eradicating the coke plants in Colombia, and why we are not doing the best that we can in Mexico. Even the United Nations has paused and stopped beating up on the United States, just paused to reflect on some of the treaties that they have signed—in what year, Jack?

Mr. CUSACK. 1961.

The CHAIRMAN. And they have revised, so they have all signed the treaty saying they are supposed to cooperate in restricting the growth and trafficking in drugs, and even though it looks like a major thrust this year, the year of drugs or whatever they want to call it, is to have another conference, at least the United Nations has admitted that there is bumper crops going.

Now my State Department and Attorney General think we have turned the corner, there is light at the end of the tunnel, we are dealing with responsible leaders, that now the supply is recognized, it is not just the question of demand, they realize that it is a threat to the very foundation of democracy, that heads of countries are now looking at it as an internal problem.

I don't care what you say, when you ask the bottom line, how much is going to be coming to the United States? It is going to be more last year than this year, more last year than the year before, and so really when it comes to production, there is just going to be more production than ever before.

I hope nobody is here from the Border Patrol. No. Good. Because in the course of the hearings we had people here from, what do you call them, the Border Patrol? The Immigration Service. When you are an American, you don't like to embarrass yourselves. There is no border policy. I really was catching hell from my members who said when you get to Texas, when you get to Arizona, when you get to San Diego, California, I want you to find out where that line is that separates the United States from Mexico. Being sarcastic.

And why? Because these people commercially are involved in trade, their private planes fly back and forth, they are their constituents, their contributors, they are married to each other. There is no border, but yet we have these gates up there and these people, we have Border Patrol people up there, and the committee had some members to go out one night in San Diego, and please correct me if I am distorting it, where thousands of people lined up at dusk, which is a Southern term, I guess, for evening, and they all wait until there is a reduction of Border Patrol people, which is arranged, and then at the appropriate hour, they just run across the border. And 30 to 40 percent of them are caught, and then they are brought back across from the other side.

Incidentally, they line up and organize on our side of the border, but it is legitimate because we can't see them, it is around a mountain cove, so even though technically they are in the United States, it doesn't count. They just get on this baseball field type of thing and rush across.

Now, a lot of these people are bringing—they tell me 30 to 40 percent of the cocaine coming from South America comes across that border, but the people are not necessarily drug traffickers,

they're mules, they're couriers, they get a couple dollars. If they make it, they make it. If they don't, there is so many of them, whoever is waiting for them on the other side, they are not really losers in the whole thing. In any event, you can walk across, you don't have to swim across, you can drive across, but the funniest thing when we talk about using the military and getting more involved and really stopping these rascals, when you talk about the Governors of these border states, these planes, they just fly back and forth anyway, and the Governor of Texas says if the Soviets ever find out about the DC-3, then we are wiped out, because our whole defense system is against the jets, the high-flying jets, but the drug planes just come across.

I don't say this to be critical of our policy, because it is no policy, and if there is anyone who really wants to think that we are going to develop one as it relates to that border, count me out. I am 56 and it ain't going to happen in my lifetime, and someone else can develop it.

But Americans on this side of the border are not going to put up any gates, any fences, anything, and anyone willing to take the risk is going to be bringing this stuff over. So I think I have taken care of supply, even though they are telling us it is really a question of demand. I think I have taken care of the question of interdiction, not in a very professional way, but at least the professionals will tell you there is not very much they can do.

And so now we get back home, and the reason I asked for us to meet is to see whether or not we can come together with an agenda to see if there is anything we can do, whether you have any suggestions in putting together this task force, because I have people coming into my office and people coming into Ben's office from all of these countries now getting the problem, asking us, "How do we resolve it?" And they walk away from DEA and Customs and State Department saying, "We got a handle on this damn thing" because they are Members of Congress, and they are setting up committees, and they are going to go back home and do something like we are doing here, and then they go around the country and say, "My God, you have those task forces in New York, you have special prosecutors, you have the police department involved in educating the kids, you really have it made in New York."

And I guess we do until we come together and talk about the problems that we have, and the last time we were together it was so frustrating that I think that most of the principals agreed that maybe we ought to come together again to see whether we could draw up a plan, whether we could see what our wish list, our agenda could be, and then there is no question in my mind that I would be able, with Ben, to provide a forum—this is the most sophisticated part of the country. You name the problem, we have it double, triple, but we have the best minds and the best agents, the most experienced people in the country, and if most of the country thinks that we are the ones that are advanced on this and the country believes it is this area and this area believes everything is falling between the cracks, well, I don't know.

Well, we found out that the state really didn't have a heavy educational program. The city is trying to implement that. We have here—when we listen to, and you guys go back to the smaller cities

and find out what the task force amounts to, staff has said we have 26,000 police; 36,000 New York State police, then we have totally in the five counties over 1300 Assistant DAs, 195 Assistant U.S. Attorneys, 249 drug enforcement agents, over 1700 Customs inspectors and agents.

And so I guess what we are saying is, can anyone deny, with the possible exception of Florida, that when it comes to resources, compared to the rest of the country, we got our act together? And if we really can't do any more than we are doing, where the average person on the street really believes we have given up on law enforcement and where the judges believe the court calendars—the prosecutors believe they have backlogs, with an increase in the prison population, but the supply is still out there, then maybe some of the people talking about legalization—well, one of the members said that on the committee, and they did admit in San Diego, and I am not going to say it, but we ought to take a look and see what we are doing with the resources that we have.

A separate issue, the committee, as a result of our hearings, has been in touch with Governor Cuomo and the State Commissioner of Education, and we are going to see what we can work out there. In addition to that, it is so bad that ten days ago I spoke with the Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, Dr. Macdonald, and reminded him that he promised to give me a model of what a Federal education program could be, so that if we got the Federal money, if we were able to persuade the local and state governments to have a program, at least we would have the benefit of the Federal expertise.

But the truth is, out of a $17 million Federal education budget, $3 million is allocated or earmarked for drug education and prevention. And so what we have tried to do here is to see whether or not we can put together an agenda, whether you think this makes any sense, because this is high on my emotional calendar, but not really high on my political agenda.

If you fellows would say, "Look, we are doing the best we can, we don't need any more task forces and we are working together as a team, we have not as many resources as we would like, what we do have we are using effectively and we can't do it any better and you are not helping, but you are part of the problem," believe me, it won't hurt me. It would just mean that I have tried just once again, and it hasn't worked out.

If you believe we will give it a try and see what we can come up with, and we have an agenda that we can go over and you can add or you can delete, and then of course where we would go from there, is that—so you would not be tied up in this, you could designate someone from your offices to go into what resources are available, what are the problems and what they would think would be necessary to deal with those problems.

After the staff would do this, I assume that they would report to you directly, and then we would regroup and see whether or not the staff has done the type of job—and I guess the final product would be won, and I say this as a New Yorker with a lot of bias, prejudice and personal pride, that we would be saying that the top people in the field, those with the maximum exposure, those that are burdened with the problem, have come together and have said

that, "This is what we think we should be doing," if indeed the climate was such that the Federal Government could respond.

That would give us on the Select Narcotics Committee at least more than confusion to present to the administration, and I suspect that nothing embarrasses you more than when you are making a recommendation to someone that you really think is the expert and you find out that the expert is asking you more about your recommendation, and then they adopt it, and you walk away wanting to let your ego say "Wow, how smart I am," but you are really scared to death that if they accept it, your inexperience and recommendation, what the hell have they been doing over the years?

But I don't mean to just go into the fact the Attorney General is very pleased with Commissioner Ward's program and has told me that he wants really to get the Federal Government behind it and to get it going in other cities around the country. Well, I feel good for the city and good for Commissioner Ward, and I thought that we should be in a position to tell all of you what we got going for us in Washington, what is available to deal with your needs and see how we can work it out.

So this is trying to think about doing it another way, and that is to put together what we would think professionally would be a good program, and then give us a chance to sell it to the Congress and the administration to see whether we can possibly get some kind of handle on this epidemic that is sweeping the country and certainly our area.

Ben Gilman and I don't work as Democrats and Republicans. He is better than I am because he comes from a county that grows onions, and they are proud of the fact that they don't make you cry when they cut them, so if you run around bragging about that, you have to be a real special person when you are involved and as dedicated as he is on the narcotics issue. And he manages to keep the politics, as much as I try, out of the Select Committee so that when we go to the Leadership, Republican or Democrat, they listen. They don't always respond. Individuals in the administration we have had no problems with. And I will have a problem if I start identifying them within the administration, so I will leave Carlton Turner and all those big wheels out of it.

But let me ask Ben to thank you for coming here, and then we will see whether we can draft an agenda together. This is my buddy, Ben Gilman.

Mr. GILMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank all of our good experts who took time out to be with us. I don't think we do enough of doing this, putting our heads together on a critical problem. We are here to do what the proverbial white lies are in Washington, "The check is in the mail", and "We gave at the office," and "We are from the Congress and we are here to help you." We really are here to try to see what we can do to be supportive and to try to get some new thinking.

And the further we go in the problem, and our good chairman and myself and many of the members of our committee have been at this for a decade, if not more, and met with many of you in various places, both here and around the world and in international forums, and we continually find that there is no black and white in this problem, there are no easy solutions, but we do find a lot of

laxity and a lot of room for improvement. As we are confronted with budgetary constraints, we are going to find we have to do more with the bucks that are available than we have been doing in the past in an ever-increasing problem.

There is some good news and bad news out there. The good news is that when we have been down in Latin America recently, we found that a lot of the new Presidents in the emerging democracies have a very strong commitment, and throughout the international community, both in Latin America, in the European Continent and in Asia, there is a growing awareness that the producing countries have become victim countries, and they have to pitch in. We are not too certain yet the directions that has to take. We are beginning to see more regional cooperation.

The bad news is that the crops are being produced more, the farmers are producing more, that our sophisticated distributors have found new ways of getting the crops through the international network and into our own shores and are finding new areas of corruption. The bad news, too, is that there is a great deal of corruption in all of these governments reaching sometimes to the highest places in those governments.

Again, the good news in all of that is that some of the Presidents now are beginning to try to weed out that corruption. But it is going to take a lot of help from all of us, and as we go around the world trying to put some teeth in what we have been doing in the Congress of cutting off economic assistance to those countries that don't have a plan and are not implementing a plan, they keep pointing back to our own country and saying, "Hey, we are trying to do something here, what are you doing about it back in your own area?" And sometimes we get a little bit red in the face when we try to explain——

The CHAIRMAN. Not all of us get red——

Mr. GILMAN [continuing]. Or a little darker complexion when we explain we have some problems in our area, but we admit we have those problems, and I am hoping with all the good thinking that is here, we can start a new schedule session, some better ideas of how to do it all.

The chairman and I have talked a long time—what we should have is a week-long retreat someplace to get all you experts together and kick it around for a good long hard session to see if there is some new strategies that can be evolved. Please bear in mind even with the Gramm-Rudman problems, with all its constitutional problems and imposition of a straightjacket on a budgetary process, there still is additional money this year for law enforcement in the narcotics area, and our staff people took a look at it, of the impact, we find that most of the agencies, despite that 4.7 cutback, are going to be able to do it without cutbacks in personnel, with the exception of Customs, who apparently is going to lose some 700 slots, but mostly slots that they hadn't filled last year. So it meant for this year, at least, there won't be major personnel problems.

But we recognize that there should be a heck of a lot more dollars than there are, but we are going to have to work with the reality that we are going to have to get a bigger bang out of the buck than we have done before.

Congressman Rangel and I just this past week introduced a measure to try to focus attention on the need for funding for education, to dig into the demand problem. And as our good chairman said, when we wandered down along the border with our recent mission, law enforcement officer after law enforcement officer testified before our committee, throwing up their hands saying "Unless we attack that supply problem, our demand efforts are going to be meaningless if we are not doing enough."

We were appalled to find right here in our own State of New York they had worked out a curriculum for narcotics but that curriculum is sitting on the shelf someplace because there isn't funding to distribute it and that there was too little being done in each of the metropolitan areas and municipalities in attempting to reduce demand, that we concentrated on interdiction, on unenforcement, a little bit in treatment, but very little in demand. And I hope that we can come up with some better thinking on the entire problem, and I don't want to take too much time. We are here to hear your thinking and see what we can do.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Would it make sense for us to introduce ourselves before we get your views on this?

Mr. GILMAN. Ben Gilman.

Mr. BROWN. Elliott Brown.

Mr. GILMAN. Elliott is our Minority Staff Director.

Mr. DEARIE. Ray Dearie, U.S. Attorney, Brooklyn.

Mr. MCKENNA. Jeremy McKenna, New York State Legislature.

Ms. KLOBERDANZ. Barbara Kloberdanz, representing Council President Andrew Stein.

Mr. HOEY. Patrick Hoey, Criminal Justice Coordinator's Office.

Ms. COLVILLE. Lorraine Colville, Secretary's Regional Representative, U.S. Department of Education.

Mr. LILLY. Levander Lilly, Assistant to Chancellor Nathan Kanonas.

Mr. FREEBORNE. Jerry Freeborne, Deputy Commissioner of Education for New York State.

Mr. RUSSELL. John Russell, Deputy Director for New York State Division of Substance Abuse Services, representing Leo Martinez.

Mr. SEITCHIK. Peter Seitchik, First Deputy Commissioner, New York City Department of Corrections.

Mr. MALONE. Brian Malone, Inspector General, New York State Department of Corrections.

Mr. CHESWORTH. Donald Chesworth, Superintendent, New York State Police.

Mr. HOGAN. John L. Hogan, Assistant Director, FBI, New York.

Mr. MILBURN. Bruce Milburn, Assistant Regional Commissioner for Criminal Investigation, IRS.

Mr. KELLY. Don Kelly, Regional Commissioner, U.S. Customs Service, New York.

Mr. STUTMAN. Robert Stutman, Special Agent in charge for DEA, New York.

Ms. BRECHER. Rea Brecher, Chief of Narcotics, Southern District, U.S. Attorney's Office, representing Rudy Giuliani.

Mr. JOHNSON. Sterling Johnson, Special Narcotics Prosecutor, New York City.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. Robert Morgenthau, District Attorney, New York County.

Mr. MURPHY. Patrick Murphy, First Deputy Commissioner, New York City Police Department.

Mr. CUSACK. John Cusack, Chief of Staff, Select Committee.

The CHAIRMAN. Could I now open it up for views as to whether this process makes any sense and see whether we should go on before we even talk about the agenda. I recognize anyone for the purpose of sharing their experience and views with the process we have started.

Ms. COLVILLE. Speaking for myself, I called Washington last week and spoke with the Secretary, as a matter of fact. And he said he would make any commitment necessary. It would be of tremendous help because it would give some of us the ability to find out what everybody is doing and I think helps each one of us to contribute to the solution of the problem.

I find reaching out on my own, I found the Archdiocese of New York is working on this problem. I said I wanted to work with them before I heard from your committee. I think this is the type of thing we have to do, because we can at least know what we are doing.

The CHAIRMAN. Are there any agencies that you would normally be working with that you have not heard that they were represented here?

Mr. JOHNSON. It is like trying an empty chair. Immigration should be here—they were invited, but they are not here.

The CHAIRMAN. Speak up. What about Immigration?

Mr. JURITH. They indicated they were going to be here. I don't know where he is. I will call the office right now.

Mr. JOHNSON. One of the things we find on the local level, I deal with a lot of agencies, FBI, IRS, a lot of our relationships are structured, and some of them are unstructured, and I think that the relationship that we have with Immigration, we would like to be closer, but we do not deal with Immigration on a structured basis.

There are a lot of arrests the police department makes, a lot of cases that I prosecute where the defendants, the major traffickers are illegal aliens or potential illegal aliens, and Immigration should be into the picture, and they are not into it.

The CHAIRMAN. I will ask staff, just so your recommendation is not just left up in the air, but we will personally start to work and see what we can do as relates to your case, but also to make certain that they send a representative as we try to weave the fabric that all of us can participate in.

Mr. MORGENTHAU. I noticed, in looking through the different recommendations, there isn't any recommendation there relating to Immigration, and I think that is—that is a key area.

Mr. CUSACK. There is back here, I think.

Mr. GILMAN. What is it you would need from Immigration?

Mr. MORGENTHAU. In the frist place, a lot of illegal aliens are convicted, and that puts a burden on the local and state facilities. No attempt is made to take them into Federal custody. I think there are probably close to 1500 inmates in the state system who are illegal immigrants.

Now that should be a Federal responsibility. They came into the country illegally. There is no effort made that I know of in any substantial way to take care of convicted felons, convicted misdemeanors.

To go one step further, when people are arrested, and this is something we have been urging, Immigration be notified they take some action if an illegal alien is picked up, particularly on low-level street drugs. That is going to have a more important impact than 15, 20 days in jail.

As I understand it, Immigration is not stretching its resources in looking at employers of illegal immigrants, and illegal immigrants are being employed. If you have limited resources, I would much rather be looking at illegal immigrants who are criminals rather than illegal immigrants being employed. I think it is a major piece of the problem.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me tell you what document I am working from. If those of you could pull out a document that says "February 10, First Meeting Agenda," at the top of it is "New York City Narcotic Control Task Force," this would be the agenda that we will be working from today, and so we would have completed one, I don't know whether we have or not, but opening statements are still open, and we are not going to restrict anybody to any parliamentary procedure. If there are some people that get an idea at any time, do feel free to express it. I am just trying to get us out of here with some of this done.

The second thing is proposals for participation of additional officials or agencies and, of course, it was brought out Immigration and Naturalization, and if we can take care of some housekeeping problems Sterling has, we will do that. In addition to that, we are just saying as to our investigational list, are there any other agencies or departments that anyone believes should be on the list that perhaps are not?

Ms. BRECHER. One of your suggestions relates to the Federal Prison System. I don't see anybody from the Bureau of Prisons here.

Mr. CUSACK. They were invited and invited in Washington. We asked them to send a representative, and here we are.

The CHAIRMAN. We are not going to give up. If this thing looks like it is going to get off the ground and we are able to talk about the people who have taken time off in order to review this thing, rest assured we are going to make a special effort to get these people involved in the task force.

Are there any other agencies that you believe we overlooked or should be here? Immigration, Bureau of Prisons?

Ms. COLVILLE. You mentioned Health and Human Services.

Mr. CUSACK. We have to apologize for a late invitation to them. The invitation fell between the cracks, but as of Friday afternoon, they thought they could have someone here.

Mr. PORTFILIO. I am here.

Mr. GILMAN. Pull up to the table here. Introduce yourself.

Mr. PORTFILIO. I am Raymond Portfilio, Deputy Regional Health Administrator for the Public Health Service.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Dr. Macdonald with Health and Human Services?

Mr. PORTFILIO. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. He has pledged himself to work with us in this area, so we can get together afterwards to see if we can share views with him. We still have to work with Immigration and Prisons.

Back to this New York City task force meeting agenda, the next thing I guess we would do is to talk about the adoption of the agenda. The agenda is to be split into supply and demand types of issues, and the only thing we will be going over this for is not to discuss the items, but to see whether or not some items should be deleted or whether or not we should add some items to it. And after we do that, we would then like to split up the agents and departments that are here, if we could, into supply or demand type of groups, and then we would start thinking about the staff that will be assigned to study the questions that we will be going over now and reporting back.

Cathy? I don't want to read all this stuff. Who want to read this stuff? This is a draft agenda that Jack Cusack, law enforcement expert, now administrator—now you are part of the problem, right—is going to read to you as some of the things that we think could possibly be on the agenda of the task force, and we may have put too much on here, or we may not have enough.

Jack, will you take it from there?

Mr. CUSACK. Gentlemen and ladies, instead of reading it, I will just go by the numbers here. If anyone thinks it is not important to study the issue that is raised, if you will make your point of view to us, we can then decide, and if there is support for taking it off, we will take it off. If there is not support, we will leave it on. When we finish going through the items that are listed, anyone that has an item that they would like to propose, an issue that they think is important, they should propose it, and we will move to put it on the agenda.

The CHAIRMAN. Well——

Mr. RUSSELL. As a point of information, on the preliminary agenda sent to us earlier, there were a number of items that were going to be considered at this meeting. Then the agenda was set up. Am I to assume the first phase of the group will be to work on supply and demand issues and other issues that were discussed, and the preliminary draft will be held at another time?

Mr. CUSACK. I think this basically follows the initial agenda that was sent to you.

The CHAIRMAN. If we missed anything or you want to add anything, please don't feel that we believe that we have come up with the idea of an agenda. I will just go through these things rather than by number—it would deal with the DEA.

Bob, we know the problems that you have in putting your budget into Washington, but for something like this, we can be talking about just what you think you could be doing in setting it up, and we are going to try our darndest to have you share this information with your colleagues and see whether or not your plan dovetails with their plans without getting anybody in trouble with OMB.

Mr. STUTMAN. I have known you very well, Mr. Chairman, and I know above all you are a practical person, and you know that at

least the agencies with Washington representation, it will be difficult for us, in all practicality, to put our names on a plan that, in effect, might go against what Washington says is the plan. And I speak in a very practical manner.

The CHAIRMAN. That is what we need.

Mr. CUSACK. The idea is, perhaps in the conference here, other people, you may not be able to agree or you might even disagree, but there may be other people who think if we are going to win this thing in New York, the Federal Government has to put more into DEA and the DEA administrator can remain silent. Maybe the Commissioner of Police would remain silent if people are pressing to put more people into his organization, but if everyone else thinks it, maybe it will happen.

The CHAIRMAN. Stan Michels is here, my friend and colleague in government from the New York City Council, who is involved in public safety and who has demonstrated an interest from the street to legislation in this.

Well, Bob, listen, you may end up, and different people have different restrictions in talking about how we can better utilize what we have got, but in the final analysis, if this is going to be the area where we really believe that we got the top-notch people, then they will be talking with each other and seeing what we can do and doing the best with what we got if it comes to that.

But I would hope that somebody would even be talking about Gramm-Rudman somewhere down the line. Notwithstanding the fact that the President has endorsed it, there is no question in my mind, I have got to word this carefully with Bernard, because he hasn't the slightest idea what the hell is in it—fortunately, the courts will protect him and maybe not protect the Congress, but, anyway, we will have the DEA, we will discuss the joint task force, we will discuss the number of prosecutors.

I always say when I am not in New York that I am the only guy that comes out to congratulate the U.S. Attorney for enforcing the narcotics laws and thank him so much. Yet I guess when the local District Attorneys have to thank him, I have to thank him too, but obviously everyone is making a decision as relates to priorities as to which cases you prosecute as a result of limited resources; and, of course, with people just looking at the system, they think you are ignoring a lot of cases, but that might depend on number four, the number of Federal judges and people in the Court of Appeals. I don't think judges have any problems expressing what they need.

Five is what Bob Morgenthau and Sterling Johnson have talked about with Immigration and Naturalization, U.S. Customs, the IRS, who I believe is supposed to face some severe cutbacks, which not only would affect the criminal enforcement, but as dumb as it may sound, will actually affect the checks, the amount of revenues that are collected, which has an effect on the budget and deficit, and we hope we can turn that around.

Then we get back to the New York area—we talked about Federal facilities, again as they relate to court facilities and detention, whether they are available, manpower, again with the New York City Police Department Narcotics Bureau, the Federal Prison System, the availability of precinct personnel, both uniform and detective, the special prosecutors in the prosecutor's office on the

county level, the judges in the courtrooms on the county and state level, state facilities as relates to detention, the state and city prison systems, and then I don't know where we turned off into demand, but it looks like it is 16, isn't it? It is mixed up.

Then we start getting involved in treatment, detoxification, its relationship to bail, probation and parole, methadone and naltrexone. Then, I don't know, but they talk about Federal and State narcotic control laws, which is a job by itself, but I guess we can exchange information and recommendations we have in legislation that is pending, and so I guess that would be the legislative task force.

Then we talk about drug abuse in the penal institutions, themselves; then we get involved with the drug abuse prevention programs in cities and private schools. Incidentally, while we were embarrassed that New York State had not had any meaningful educational programs and we found law enforcement talking about how important they were, we didn't find them in Boston, in Chicago——

Mr. CUSACK. Well, a week in Texas——

The CHAIRMAN. We didn't find them any place else. It is a national problem rather than a New York State problem. Then treatment programs for young people, adolescents and adults.

Ben and I are looking forward to meetings we are going to have with the Advertising Council using our Congressional influence to try to get some of the major industries to make more contributions to the Advertising Council to see whether or not they can use the airwaves in a more effective way in the area of drug prevention and drug use, using the same people who put together the effective "Just say no" campaigns. But that is something else.

Now, are there issues that you think could be on this paper or should be deleted from the paper or——

Mr. JOHNSON. Can we put item 12 to be considered with item 3? Because if you are talking about expanding the role of prosecutors, on the local level we have numbers that are just insurmountable, and I think they should be put together, and I think that should be covered in one item or at least move 12 up to number 3.

The CHAIRMAN. Ben?

Mr. GILMAN. We are pleased to be joined by, having with us Senator D'Amato's representatives, Morgan Hardiman, counsel; Phyllis Cohen is the assistant. She is in the back over here.

The CHAIRMAN. This may be too ambitious, but these were some thoughts we had, and I can't emphasize how flexible we are if you have other thoughts. We have covered up to seven, and I guess now comes the hard work as to how many people would agree that they would be willing to designate someone to work on these issues, and this is not for any public relations things, and if you really believe at this point, after listening to all that we have talked about, that it is not feasible, I think as adult professionals we ought to talk about it.

Mr. Dearie has gone on the bench, and maybe he can be more candid than the rest of us, but I am convinced when he gets on the bench he is going to be restricted in the amount of cases he can handle. He will be hearing from the Bureau of Prisons as to what he can or cannot do or consulting with the U.S. Attorneys as to the number of cases they can handle.

Now, if we are re-inventing the wheel, please give me the opportunity to check out of this because we have a heavy agenda, and I have a lot of things I have to do. If, on the other hand, you feel it is worth just a try, we will try it. How do you frame the question without embarrassing anybody, Jack?

Mr. CUSACK. Well, I think if anyone has the courage to stand up and say he thinks this is a waste of time or an exercise in futility, he should do so, and if he gets support, then we will have a decision that this idea is not a very good one, and it should be scrapped.

On the other hand, if we are ready to go forward to figure out how we translate these needs into a strategy, a paper that can be put together sometime in the late spring, and if the Federal Government can come out with a strategy every year or two, which they do unilaterally—they don't talk to the states or cities formally—why can't the City of New York come up with a strategy where they tell the nation, as the primary victim of this problem, as the center of much of the importation and distribution throughout the country, what they need to defend their people, streets and city?

That is basically what we are asking, is for the state—for the local people to develop a strategy in concert with state and Federal officials with whom they must work.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me say this, and I will throw it into your ball park, Commissioner, there could be some apprehensions too that elected officials have called this together. I am just raising all the possible strawmen, and especially when you are dealing with such a dynamic personality as the chair, who is constantly called on to run for United States Senator, Governor, Majority Whip, one might suspect it is political.

So please let us consider—except my constituents, they don't call on me to do these great things—maybe this should be something that the police chief—and I am not passing the buck—should be the chairperson of the task force, where Ben and I would be members, where our staffs would be available, where we could just be supportive of the efforts, because the only thing that makes it national is our local price in believing if there are any ideas, this group has them, and we want to be able to take it to your Congress and take it to your administration.

I now recognize Pat Murphy, because there is nothing that I would like better, with the fine work that is being done and the innovative work that is being done by the Commissioner, and I wish he were here because I don't want to put you on the spot, to chair this type of committee, or anyone else for that matter.

Mr. MURPHY. Thank you.

One thing that I notice, which is not on the agenda, is something that has been raised before by public officials from New York, and that is to involve the military, the United States military, in doing something to impact on the importation of drugs into the country. We are not able to do it alone. Even increasing our resources and giving us more judges won't stop the basic problem we have, bringing the stuff into the city. The military has, I think, much better ways to impact on importation than we will on a local basis here in New York City.

It comes either from the South, most of our stuff, and we don't know how much comes through New York as a port of entry. We have discussed the military being brought in to help, and I think it is time that they should do it, and I think collectively, at least I know we feel here in New York City law enforcement, it is time for the military to do something, and I think that might be supported by most of the people you have asked to come here today.

The CHAIRMAN. Ben Gilman would like to respond to that.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Chairman, we have been pushing on the military involvement and have eased up the posse comitatus restrictions—that was a restriction that prevented the military, as you know, from getting involved in arrests and any criminal enforcement activity or any civil responsibility.

However, they are in it now, the Navy, the Air Force, the Coast Guard, of course, has always been in it. Their principal activity now has been interdiction in assisting our enforcement agencies in cutting off the supply routes, in air surveillance and intelligence gathering to be supportive. They still cannot under the present statute engage in actual arrests or in actual criminal investigation. But we have expanded their authority and responsibilities and are now beginning to see some benefits from all of that in closing off the supply routes.

Right now there is underway—what is that operation called?

Mr. KELLY. "Hat trick."

Mr. GILMAN. That has closed off some of the Southern routes into our own nation and is working fairly good. We still do not have further authority than that.

The CHAIRMAN. There was a strong resistance by the Military Commissioner to getting involved in this. They always said that they didn't want to detract from their national security mission, and then we went along with them in their training programs. We have found in recent months an enthusiasm coming from the armed forces for the first time in really feeling that they are making a contribution to our national security by getting involved. We have a long way to go in this area, but we would agree that they should be a part of the task force.

Ben.

Mr. GILMAN. Yes. I think Mr. Kelly can give you a little more detail about "hat trick" underway right now.

Mr. KELLY. We have a structure for doing what you suggest, Mr. Gilman. Under that aegis right now there is an operation, a blockade operation in South America, source countries in South America conducted by principally the Coast Guard but backed up by the Navy under the restrictions of the posse comitatus act you have mentioned.

We have supported "hat trick" from the Army, and it is going along rather well. It is being backed by Customs. We have devoted a large number of resources to that operation. So that if the structure—to run that type of thing and take advantage of Defense Department resources is in place right now. We should be taking better advantage of that in Florida structure.

The CHAIRMAN. Commissioner, the question of military involvement will be item 15, and the task force will put it in its appropriate place in terms of issues that will be taken up, but in that way,

if this thing gets off the ground, I want you to know we feel a special responsibility to bring in the experts that are supposedly doing these things to share with you what they are doing or not doing so you can reach some opinion.

Let me get back to what I was saying about Police Commissioner Ward. I truly believe he has taken a lot of risks in these areas and is involved in a lot of programs which have given confidence to a lot of people in the community, that he is really concerned about the drug enforcement, and I really don't believe it should be the U.S. Attorney's office or one of the DEA offices. Maybe Sterling Johnson, who covers five counties, might be the appropriate person.

Do people really think there might be too much of a political flavor coming from the Congress? Even though I won't be participating with the task force except to get the ideas that you have and to make available to you whatever resources the committee would have, could we talk about that for a few minutes, as to if you really wanted to do this, do you think there is a better way to do it?

My thinking only was that here is a guy that looks like he is in charge of law enforcement, and he has to reach out to the State and Feds in trying to coordinate it.

Do we want to discuss that any further?

Mr. DEARIE. It seems to me that the reticence that we seem to be detecting here is not so much who should chair and how it should be organized. I think realistically everybody comes with a certain amount of viewpoint. We all have institutional differences. We all agree on what the nature of the problem is, how resources ought to be deployed, and what program is more valuable than the other.

So, we come with a lot of viewpoints with a general consensus as to what the nature of the problems are. And I think if there is a reluctance or reticence in the group, it is finding a way, given those differences and the constituency and own organizations—we can nevertheless come together productively—it seems to me that today—1985 we are talking—certainly within the law enforcement community, much more frequently, more productively than we have in the past.

But if there is one thing I think there is a specific consensus on, it gets down to the bottom of the agenda, and I am not saying the working group should limit its discussions and work on that, but on the demand side, the last item on the agenda, 22, whatever it is, it is something that has excited me for years, and that is: Why have we not been able—through the use of our elected officials—why have we not been able to excite the people with the same levels of excitement that gives rise to marches in the street and campaigns against all the social ills that we have isolated in recent years?

Somehow we have failed as a community of public officials, law enforcement officials, to even sense the outrage or sense of enthusiasm of the public. Mothers Against Drunk Driving have done a better job than we have.

It seems if you bring an entire group of government leaders and political leaders together, somehow we can isolate a vehicle to plug that excitement in, to turn the people on. That would be an enormous accomplishment of this group or any group.

We are all reluctant, because we all have different views we have been discussing for years, and it is a productive discussion. I think in that area, in the idea of exciting the public and really educating the public, there is enormous benefit that could accrue from an activity such as this.

The CHAIRMAN. We are truly excited about where we are going in this area. And the council, Advertising Council, has asked us to have a special hearing where they could share with us what they think they can really do in this area.

I don't want to get into any trouble with the media, but some of them have been a part of the problem where they didn't think that drugs was really as serious as drunk driving, and some of them have advocated in their editorials we ought to explore legalization. So, the Drug Council has been a little more conservative, a little more on target. I agree with you 100 percent.

Why don't you handle it from here?

Mr. GILMAN. I would like to introduce Alan Freeze, Acting Chief of Investigations, INS. Alan is seated at the table.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you know Sterling Johnson? He is our Special Prosecutor in Narcotics cases. He is concerned there should be more cooperation with Immigration as well as our New York County DA, and what happens when he turns them over to you. So, you should know each other.

Mr. GILMAN. I think it is important we get into discussion on your ideas. Our time is limited, and let's make good use of some of these ideas.

Bob Stutman.

Mr. STUTMAN. Let me be the first one who is not going to be a Federal Judge speak up.

I guess the only thing that bothers me—and I guess I, as well as anyone here, know this is not a political issue for you or Mr. Gilman—clearly, in the last four or five months the FBI, Customs, myself, Sterling, Ray Jones from the Police Department, speak almost on a daily basis about the issue I, II—certainly I and II. We all agree we need more manpower; nobody argues that.

I am not sure what we are going to come up with in the enforcement area that is going to be different for this committee than what we do sitting together on a daily basis. I am going to take it one step further.

One thing that certainly does excite me is getting enforcement involved on the demand side. And, again, that may sound like a broken record, but you are right; it hasn't happened. And I would love to get involved with that. I certainly will go along with——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me tell you, Bob—and I might sound like a broken record—but what I hope that we are able to do, assuming that you guys are doing it already, and ladies as well, that you are meeting; that you do have a strategy. I am telling you I damn near got the hopelessness out of the panel that we had in the Federal Building, as I got in San Diego and Tucson and El Paso—you know, we are doing the best we can.

But yes, there is going to be more on the street. Yes, there is going to be more arrests. Yes, there is going to be more addiction. So, I am assuming that you are working together.

If you really think that that is a good strategy, then all I am asking you to do is to put that strategy on paper and see whether we can sell that damn strategy to the nation.

Of course, let me say in all honesty to you that if your strategy is the best that we got in the nation, I may check out of this thing completely. I may just say, listen, maybe legalization in the free marketplace—I will deny that I have said it here—but, you know, let it work its will; take the profits out of it; let the racketeers compete with the Federal Government, and we will run those rascals back to South America and give drug stamps to those who can't afford it. And what the hell—I don't know.

But I do know this: that I am thoroughly convinced we have the best minds here. And if you are saying you are doing the job——

Mr. STUTMAN. I said we are starting. We are starting to tuck and develop strategies. I will not tell you the strategy has been in place.

The CHAIRMAN. What I am saying is, if you are talking—and this is not going to be something locked in concrete—and you are developing the strategy, what we can promise you is that we can take that strategy to the Congress. We can take those parts that you think are working, and we can bring the people together.

I mean, it bothers me that Dr. Macdonald is waiting for me for a damn strategy. It is better than not talking with people. But, it bothers me that Ben Ward's program is going to be adopted by the Attorney General. I am selling Ben Ward's program to the Attorney General. If you got these good things, maybe we can get a national support for it without you putting your neck on the line.

Mr. LILLY. Mr. Chairman, I am here representing Chancellor Nathan Canonas, and he assigned me to participate in the forum, and we welcome the idea. Certainly, I feel that this is a worthy forum, as indicated by your description of the program that the Chancellor and Commissioner Ward developed—a year ago, as a matter of fact, to this date—and it is indicative of what coordination can do.

If we had it on a broader scale, and if we could do more coordination and linking up of services and ideas, I think what we did with Specter, the Police Board of Education Program, is just the beginning. Certainly, we are looking forward to participating on this forum.

The CHAIRMAN. Bob, listen—is he gone? Son of a gun.

Let me talk with you, Sterling.

Where do you think we should go from here? Do we get back and ask that you designate someone on the work force because we don't expect you people to be going over these things? If, indeed, you have done these things, it will be nothing just to dictate them and put them together.

Mr. JOHNSON. I think we should designate subordinates as a working committee and then get together and meet again. I am committed to giving up some people.

The CHAIRMAN. Listen, the staff has put together——

Mr. GILMAN. May I interrupt?

The CHAIRMAN. Let me just say this, Ben.

The staff has put together another sheet, New York City Narcotics Controls Task Force, and it may look as though we made deci-

sions, but we just had it prepared in case you believe this is the way to go.

And while Ben is talking—has everyone got that? It splits people down by office, and Drug Supply Reduction Task Force, Drug Demand Reduction Task Force, and then it throws the elected officials out of it, really, because we can come up with the legislation and administration ideas.

Ben?

Mr. GILMAN. I just would like to ask a question.

Bob, you say you get together on a day-to-day basis. Has a group like this gathered together in the past, of all of the good experts represented here, to look at strategy and look at enforcement, look at demand, look at supply?

Mr. STUTMAN. No. The enforcement people get together to talk about enforcement strategy.

Mr. GILMAN. It is my impression a group like this has not gotten together before. Is that accurate?

Mr. STUTMAN. That is correct.

Mr. GILMAN. There should be some benefit of getting all of these good heads together. The last thing we need is another study.

What we do need is some good ideas and action to go with the ideas. If, out of a group like this, we can put together new thinking and a new approach, we won't have our Chairman walking away from the problem suggesting legalization, as so many are doing now.

So, I would hope we can avoid all of the formal kind of organizational problems and what kind of table you sit around, what kind of a group you have, but get down to trying to come up with some new thinking and new approaches. Let's try to streamline that so we don't get bogged down in the procedural aspect.

The CHAIRMAN. The line between the question of supply and demand is very thin, and we are impressed with the number of drug enforcement experts that are emphasizing the question of education. But we thought maybe if we just did it in this arbitrary way where supply is the Police Commissioner, Prosecutor, U.S. Attorney's Office, Customs, IRS, FBI, and State Police and Corrections, and then put demand with the substantive abuse, education and drug prevention, and U.S. education, and we deliberately left the elected officials out because we will be part of your staff and resources to do whatever you would suggest that we could do, that you will come up with a strategy.

And, Bob, I don't expect that strategy—that you will be saying this is the answer. But I would expect that you would be saying this is what I think the Congress and Administration should be looking at in terms of trying to develop a national strategy. And I am just saying if we can't do it in this area of the country, with what I listened to from other law officials, it is sad.

Stan, you were trying——

Mr. MICHELS. Yes. I am very appreciative of the formation of this group and participation of the distinguished people in this field.

I am talking on a local level, as you know, having represented my district and knowing the problems we have in the lower part of Manhattan with cocaine especially, and the fact we are getting a reputation of not only Dodge City but also the fact that we are

being told we are the retail capital of cocaine, in New York City, at least.

I am very concerned about that because I have been talking to a lot of my constituents, and you have spoken to them as well, as to the problems they have and the constant fear in which they live under. That is why it is important we put a timeframe as to what we are doing and when we are going to come up with some results.

Looking through these various items in the agenda, there is one item which I think is glaringly left out of here, and the reason maybe it is not in here is that it cannot be addressed; that is, the sentencing of criminals convicted of these crimes and the fact we have people constantly back on the streets right away and that people are afraid to testify against them, afraid to live because they know even though they will be convicted, they will soon be back on the streets or have someone else back on the streets.

It is very rare we see people convicted who are first-time offenders. And we find they are multiple-offenders and they are back on the streets again and again.

I don't know if we need new laws, but perhaps we need an educational system to educate our judges to the fact we have got to keep these people in the prisons and try to rehabilitate them, if possible, in the prisons. We cannot keep turning them back and back to the streets and causing fear in our neighborhoods.

What we are doing is defeating the very thing we are trying to solve here.

The CHAIRMAN. You are right.

We put military in at what number?

Mr. JOHNSON. Fifteen.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-three would be sentencing.

Most of you know, that were involved in Federal prosecution, that we did have mandatory sentencing in violation of Title XVIII, and for some reason it was changed, and they were mandatory there, and that is a legitimate issue.

Mr. MICHELS. The State and Federal Government——

Mr. JOHNSON. That also ties in with Immigration.

Mr. MICHELS. That is another particular problem I want to touch on, and that is, the fact is many of the people who are convicted of narcotics are undocumented persons. And if the simple solution is to ship them back to where they came, it doesn't solve a thing because they come back quicker than they would have if they had been put on probation.

The fact of the matter is, that doesn't solve anything, just by deporting people. I think even if they are undocumented, it may be we are going to come to the conclusion the best thing to do in this case is to give them a hard time. It doesn't solve anything just to deport them.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Ben wants to encourage discussion, and I don't want to encourage discussion and stimulate thought. That is what he wants to do. That is the Republican way. I want to find out whether it makes sense to really say we are going to call a meeting and whether or not we can call the next meeting with whomever you suggest that would be acting for your department or working group meeting where we can take a look at these ideas with staff and come up

with some recommendations for a strategy. That is what I would like to do.

And I would ask for stimulating discussion on whether that makes any sense.

Mr. CUSACK. Yes, that makes sense.

The CHAIRMAN. Listen, you are right. There is a reluctancy here for us, especially professionals, to walk away saying here we go again. But I do wish that you would try and give it just one more shot here, because it is bad out there, and you just have to take our word for it that we don't see it improving overseas.

We don't really see how it is possible to do anything with those damn borders, and we are just going to have to protect our people on the local and State level the best we can with the best strategy that we can have. And maybe, even if you can find some good out of a negative scenario, that if we throw up our hands, maybe the people in Washington would say, if the caliber of people in the City and State of New York—where, in order to be assigned here you have to already prove you are among the best—and you got the Chairman and Ranking Member of the Select Narcotics Committee, and probably the majority working with you, that if we can't come up with something, then what the heck do you expect those guys from Oklahoma and Arizona are whispering in the Attorney General's ear?

And he is from San Diego. I am telling him about the borders, and he tells me worse. He knows San Diego, and it is wide-open. Let's give it a crack and let's not be disappointed if it doesn't work.

Where do we go from here? Do we have dates or something we can call meetings?

Mr. CUSACK. I think we can ask the principals here today, within the next week to 10 days, to select someone in their agency to represent them on a working group, and then we will call a meeting within the next two weeks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there a better place we can meet where it would be more conducive to people sitting around and taking notes?

Mr. STUTMAN. Are we separating enforcement from demand?

The CHAIRMAN. I suspect it would be the same place, the same date. But I think that we are separating——

Mr. STUTMAN. I would like to second Ray's suggestion. I would love to have some enforcement input into the demand side.

Mr. CUSACK. You can have that. I think they can be interchanged. In other words, they can participate—you can participate in their meetings. There is some criss-crossing here.

The CHAIRMAN. If I were sitting over here with Education, I don't think I could draw up a plan unless I had some enforcement people saying, "What do you think about it, or what will you have done?" And, quite frankly, with New York City, with Education and the New York City Police Department, Lilly really can't do too much unless he is working with Ward's people. So, it will just have to work out.

I am not suggesting that we will have them in different locations, but staff thought that as much as we could find some gray area that we would divide law enforcement, put them in jail, from treatment, detox, and give them treatment.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would like to add this whole issue, that is going to require a look from law enforcement. We will have to change the laws. It is based on the issue of designer drugs. It has become a very important problem in addition to the drugs imported.

We have to start looking to that area, because if we do something with the imported drugs, these guys working in these clandestine laboratories will be one step ahead of us.

Mr. CUSACK. That can be taken up on the item which says do we need changes in the laws.

Mr. JOHNSON. Is there going to come a time when there is going to be some White House participation? Should we invite them? Are we going to draft——

The CHAIRMAN. Let me tell you this: That was not my original thinking, but I am not wedded to my original thinking. And if you pros get together and believe, instead of presenting a strategy you want to develop a strategy, then just give us an opportunity to share with you who the White House is and you may rethink it—I mean, on strategy.

We will give you Carlton Turner from Mississippi to develop some strategy with you, or Nancy Reagan is riding the point on this issue, and Jon Thomas is involved with the international.

Bob doesn't need Jack Lawn, and I don't think anyone needs Webster.

The connection is there with the Administration. If, at any given point, because of the titles that you have, we know how to write a diplomatic letter requesting who the heck you would want to sit in with you—it is easy. As a matter of fact, that is really—if there is a hidden agenda—it is to take advantage of your offices by saying, listen, these people have thought the darn thing out. At least review their recommendations and see whether or not this strategy will work.

So, if before you reach the strategy you would say you need more input, please call me at home, anywhere. Call Ben. Tell us who you need. You may need Jon Thomas; I don't know.

Mr. GILMAN. I think that is why it is important whoever takes part in these discussions be policy people, people who can make decisions and give us thinking and not just have to pass it up through the channels and come back down, and we will get too much of the old stereotyped thinking we have had in the past, a lot of which has not worked. So, I would hope it would be key players who could come up with thinking and be in a position to implement that kind of thing.

The CHAIRMAN. Do you want to deal with dates, Jack?

Mr. CUSACK. I would say to give everyone an opportunity, so they have about a week to 10 days to figure out who there representative is going to be. We will communicate by telephone and set up a meeting.

The CHAIRMAN. Or we could send out the invitations as we did this time, except say that if you personally don't want to participate, please check with us as to whether or not you are sending a representative.

Then comes a question of the environment, the place that you want to do it. I think we can do better than this in the Federal Building, but why not the Federal Building?

Mr. CUSACK. Which Federal Building?

The CHAIRMAN. This one right here. We will set it up in a way that will be conducive to taking notes. And you can bring staff people. We will bring staff people. And so the next invitation will make it abundantly clear, based on the attendance list, that you will either designate or you will be here to explore how we can work on this list, and we will have an agenda which says we are available to bring whatever resources you may need without bringing up the plan.

Mr. GILMAN. Please try to be there yourselves rather than a designated third echelon assistant that is going to really put this thing in a very artificial type of discussion. We need your top thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. Let's discuss that, Ben, because the way staff has done this, we give them the flexibility of designating the technician to come up with the ideas, and then we ask them to come back and to endorse what has been done as a group, which would be the product of them, you know. So, really, if they have a close staff person, I don't think it is important—like Ray said, they have been around this wheel before. They just need someone to put it down on paper.

And we may ask them one more shot to say, is this your idea, and do you support it, and we will take it from there. But they can do it any way they would want.

Deputy Chief Frank Hall will be the lead guy here. The ball is in our court.

I have to quit. I am exhausted. I want to thank you.

I don't know whether it is going to work. Let's take five minutes to get the views of anybody on anything related to this.

Anyone seeking recognition?

This is the most exciting group I have spoken to in years.

Mr. MCKENNA. The Select Committee is going to staff this?

The CHAIRMAN. No. We are going to have staff here, a sufficient amount of staff here, to be able to identify what you really need and to help get it for you. But if you have some idea, we are not going to take it down and reduce it to writing and correct it and——

Mr. MCKENNA. Do you need a contribution toward your staff?

Mr. CUSACK. At certain points, there will be need for staff, I should think, to help write. In other words, if questions are laid on your office, your staff would write it up and bring it into the coordinators.

The CHAIRMAN. Bob, has this been done before? Would not a task force have done something similar in saying, if someone were to ask what is the task force doing, would not the staffs have come together and put together a document and say this is what we are doing in response to a question?

In other words, if I were having a hearing and I would say we want a statement as to the effectiveness of the task force, I would have no problem.

Mr. MCKENNA. The reason I ask, someone has to control the flow of paper here.

Mr. CUSACK. That will be worked out at the next meeting when we get the working players here.

Mr. MCKENNA. April 1 is the New York State budget deadline. By the 1st of June, you are operating under a time constraint if you want to do anything this year. Right now, there is a lot of funding coming from the State into the city, and the Special Narcotics Prosecutor, and what-have-you. So, you are going to have to move quickly to have an impact this year.

Mr. CUSACK. I think—my experience in the budgetary process—it would be pretty hard for us to put a meaningful document together that would impact this coming fiscal year. It may be for the following fiscal year we are going to have a good paper.

Mr. MCKENNA. Will you need a contribution from the State toward the staff?

The CHAIRMAN. That would be great. That would be fantastic. Yes, that would be great.

And what Bob is saying is, if you do feel that you have these bureaucratic restrictions in terms of the recommendations, then certainly we are restricted. Not knowing where Gramm-Rudman is, we can't promise a damn thing with this thing over our heads. At least we would see where you are placing the priorities. And if you really are going to do what I think you are going to do, we can have agents in the classrooms and on television and everything else. But I don't know.

But one thing, we will—if we don't come up with it, we will understand the problems and why we didn't. That, too, will be a contribution.

Ben.

Mr. GILMAN. With regard to the staffing problem, we certainly will welcome volunteers from any agency. We are doing things on a very informal basis, and the quicker we can move, the better off we will all be. And the more help we get from everyone, the better off we will all be.

I would hope you wouldn't wait for the next meeting to come up with things, and I hope you start feeding them in to us along the way. If you do, we can put together a paper before the next meeting, try to get the wheels moving on new thinking.

The CHAIRMAN. Let me sincerely thank you.

I had the same apprehensions before I came here. But, what the heck, we are all in the same business. We all have the same objectives and goals. And we will see where we can go.

Let me sincerely thank you, and I hope the next meeting is a success.

[Whereupon, at 11:36 a.m., the Select Committee adjourned, subject to the call of the Chair.]

○